arXiv:1407.4649v1 [gr-qc] 17 Jul 2014

On the small redshift limit of steady states of the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system and their stability

Mahir Hadžić
King's College London
Department of Mathematics
Strand
London, WC2R 2LS
email: mahir.hadzic@kcl.ac.uk

Gerhard Rein
Fakultät für Mathematik, Physik und Informatik
Universität Bayreuth
D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany
email: gerhard.rein@uni-bayreuth.de

July 18, 2014

Abstract

Families of steady states of the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system are constructed, which are parametrized by the central redshift. It is shown that as the central redshift tends to zero, the states in such a family are well approximated by a steady state of the Vlasov-Poisson system, i.e., a Newtonian limit is established where the speed of light is kept constant as it should be and the limiting behavior is analyzed in terms of a parameter which is tied to the physical properties of the individual solutions. This result is then used to investigate the stability properties of the relativistic steady states with small redshift parameter in the spirit of recent work by the same authors, i.e., the second variation of the ADM mass about such a steady state is shown to be positive definite on a suitable class of states.

1 Introduction

For a relativistic physical theory it is important to understand its non-relativistic limit. To this end the speed of light c is often taken to infinity in the equations of the relativistic theory, and the corresponding non-relativistic equations pop out. A more rigorous approach is to prove that solutions of the relativistic equations converge to solutions of the non-relativistic ones in the limit $c \to \infty$. However, both maneuvers are somewhat unsatisfactory, because in a given set of units the speed of light is a constant. A more satisfactory approach is to identify families of solutions of the relativistic theory which are parametrized by a physically meaningful parameter and to show that these solutions are approximated well by solutions of the corresponding non-relativistic system when the parameter tends to some limit. Following this idea we consider in the present paper steady states of the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system which we parametrize by the central redshift. We show that they are approximated well by steady states of the Vlasov-Poisson system when the central redshift is small. Besides the general issue addressed above our motivation for this analysis is to deduce stability properties of the relativistic steady states with small central redshift. As opposed to the Vlasov-Poisson system the stability properties of steady states of the Einstein-Vlasov system are mathematically rather poorly understood. In [7] the present authors study this stability problem using the $c \to \infty$ trick and then reinterpreting the result in terms of the central redshift of the steady states. The present approach is more direct and at the same time physically more meaningful.

Both the Einstein-Vlasov system and the Vlasov-Poisson system describe large ensembles of particles which interact only via gravity. Galaxies or globular clusters, where the stars play the role of the particles, can be modeled as such ensembles, since collisions among stars are sufficiently rare to be neglected. The number density of the ensemble on phase space is denoted by f, and we assume that all the particles in the ensemble have the same rest mass which is normalized to unity. We restrict ourselves to the spherically symmetric, static situation. For the Einstein-Vlasov system we can therefore write the metric in Schwarzschild form

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\mu(r)}dt^2 + e^{2\lambda(r)}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\varphi^2).$$

Here $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the time coordinate, $r \in [0, \infty[$ is the area radius, $\theta \in [0, \pi]$, and $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$. It is useful to introduce the corresponding Cartesian spatial coordinates

$$x = (r\sin\theta\cos\phi, r\sin\theta\sin\phi, r\cos\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Asymptotic flatness and a regular center of the spacetime correspond to the boundary conditions

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\lambda(r)=\lim_{r\to\infty}\mu(r)=0=\lambda(0). \tag{1.1}$$

The metric coefficients obey the field equations

$$e^{-2\lambda}(2r\lambda'-1)+1=8\pi r^2\rho, \tag{1.2}$$

$$e^{-2\lambda}(2r\mu'+1)-1=8\pi r^2 p, \tag{1.3}$$

The spatial mass-energy density ρ and the radial pressure p are given in terms of the phase space density f by

$$\rho(r)=\rho(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(x,v)\sqrt{1+|v|^2}\,dv \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$p(r)=p(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(x,v)\,\left(\frac{x\cdot v}{r}\right)^2\,dv. \tag{1.5}$$

Here $v\in\mathbb{R}^3$ denotes a non-canonical momentum coordinate, and $f=f(x,v)$ is spherically symmetric, i.e., by abuse of notation, $f(x,v)=f(r,w,L)$ where

$$r=|x|,\ w=\frac{x\cdot v}{r},\ L=|x\times v|^2;$$

$|v|$ and $x\cdot v$ denote the Euclidean norm and scalar product respectively. The fact that the density f on phase space satisfies the Vlasov equation can equivalently be expressed by demanding that f is constant along particle trajectories, i.e., along solutions of the characteristic system

$$\dot{x}=e^{\mu-\lambda}\frac{v}{\sqrt{1+|v|^2}},\ \dot{v}=-e^{\mu-\lambda}\sqrt{1+|v|^2}\mu'(r)\frac{x}{r}.$$

The analogous system in the Newtonian context, i.e., the Vlasov-Poisson system, reads

$$\Delta U=4\pi\rho,\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty}U(x)=0,$$

$$\rho(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(x,v)\,dv,$$

$$\dot{x}=v,\ \dot{x}=-\nabla U(x).$$

Here U denotes the gravitational potential and again only the static situation is considered. In [19] it was shown that solutions of the time-dependent

Einstein-Vlasov system converge to those of the Vlasov-Poisson system when the speed of light is inserted into the former system and is taken to infinity.

In the static situation the particle energy E defined in (2.1) and (2.2) is constant along characteristics in both cases. Hence the static Vlasov equation is satisfied if f is taken to be a function of the particle energy, i.e.,

$$f(x, v) = \phi(E). \tag{1.6}$$

This ansatz reduces the corresponding system to the field equation(s) with source terms which now depend on the metric or the potential. A fixed ansatz function typically yields a one-parameter family of steady states, and for the case of the Einstein-Vlasov system this can be done in such a way that the parameter becomes the central redshift κ of the resulting galaxy which is a physically meaningful measure for the strength of relativistic effects in that steady state. The details of this parametrization are discussed in Section 2. Our first main result then says that as $\kappa \to 0$ in such a one-parameter family the corresponding steady states are well approximated by the corresponding Newtonian steady state. This result is derived in Section 3. The result can then be used to deduce stability properties for steady states of the Einstein-Vlasov system which have small central redshift. The key to stability results for the Vlasov-Poisson system is to show that on a suitable manifold of dynamically accessible states at a given steady state the second variation of the total energy or Hamiltonian is positive definite. We deduce the corresponding positivity result for the Einstein-Vlasov system when the central redshift κ is small. This is in accordance with the time-honored Zel'dovitch conjecture which says that in such a one-parameter family of steady states stability holds only as long as the states are not too relativistic. In Section 4 we discuss the general framework for the stability analysis for the Einstein-Vlasov system and put it into the context of stability results from the astrophysics literature and in particular of the work of Zel'dovitch. The positive definiteness of the second variation of the Hamiltonian, i.e., of the ADM mass of the system is proven in Section 5.

2 One-parameter families of steady states

The problem of constructing static solutions with finite mass and compact support for the Vlasov-Poisson and Einstein-Vlasov system has been studied in a number of papers, cf. [15, 16, 20, 21]. In order to arrive at families of steady states of the Einstein-Vlasov system which are parametrized by the

central redshift we need to briefly review some of the corresponding arguments; we also refer to [3] where such families and their stability properties were studied numerically.

For the static Einstein-Vlasov system the particle energy takes the form

$$E = E(x, v) = e^{\mu(x)}\sqrt{1 + |v|^2}, \tag{2.1}$$

for the Vlasov-Poisson system the analogous quantity reads

$$E = E(x, v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|^2 + U(x). \tag{2.2}$$

Since the particle energy in conserved along particle trajectories any function of the particle energy defines a solution of the corresponding Vlasov equation if the metric or the potential are viewed as given. In the relativistic case we make the ansatz that

$$f(x, v) = \phi(E) = \Phi\left(1 - \frac{E}{E_0}\right). \tag{2.3}$$

Here $E_0 > 0$ is a prescribed cut-off energy—notice that the particle energy (2.1) is always positive—, and Φ has the following properties:

Assumptions on Φ. $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty[$ is measurable, $\Phi(\eta) = 0$ for $\eta < 0$, and for $\eta \to 0+$,

$$\Phi(\eta) = C\eta^k + \mathrm{O}(\eta^{k+\delta}) \tag{2.4}$$

with $0 < k < 3/2$, $\delta > 0$, and $C > 0$.

This ansatz function Φ is now kept fixed. We notice that only the metric quantity μ enters into the definition of the particle energy E in (2.1) and the field equations can be reduced to an equation for μ. It is tempting to prescribe $\mu(0)$, but since the ansatz (2.3) contains the cut-off energy E_0 as another, in principle free parameter and since μ must vanish at infinity due to (1.1) this approach is not feasible. Instead we define $y := \ln E_0 - \mu$ so that $e^{\mu} = E_0 e^{-y}$. For the ansatz (2.3) the spatial mass density and pressure become functions of y, i.e.,

$$\rho(r) = g(y(r)), \quad p(r) = h(y(r)), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$g(y) := \begin{cases} 4\pi e^{3y} \int_0^{1-e^{-y}} \Phi(\eta)\,(1-\eta)^2 \left(e^{2y}(1-\eta)^2 - 1\right)^{1/2} d\eta \,, & y > 0, \\ 0 \,, & y \leq 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$h(y) := \begin{cases} \frac{4\pi}{3} e^y \int_0^{1-e^{-y}} \Phi(\eta) \left(e^{2y}(1-\eta)^2 - 1\right)^{3/2} d\eta \, , & y > 0, \\ 0 & , y \leq 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

The functions g and h are continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$, cf. [21, Lemma 2.2]. The metric coefficient λ can be eliminated from the system, because the field equation (1.2) together with the boundary condition (1.1) at zero imply that

$$e^{-2\lambda(r)} = 1 - \frac{2m(r)}{r}, \tag{2.8}$$

where the mass function m is defined in terms of ρ by

$$m(r) = m(r, y) = 4\pi \int_0^r \sigma^2 \rho(\sigma) \, d\sigma. \tag{2.9}$$

Hence the static Einstein-Vlasov system is reduced to the equation

$$y'(r) = -\frac{1}{1 - 2m(r)/r} \left(\frac{m(r)}{r^2} + 4\pi r p(r) \right), \tag{2.10}$$

where m, ρ, and p are given in terms of y by (2.5) and (2.9).

In [15] it is shown that for every central value

$$y(0) = \kappa > 0, \tag{2.11}$$

there exists a unique smooth solution $y = y_\kappa$ to (2.10) which exists on $[0, \infty[$ and which has a unique zero at some radius $R > 0$. In view of (2.5)–(2.7) this implies that the induced quantities ρ and p are supported on the interval $[0, R]$, and a non-trivial steady state of the Einstein-Vlasov system with compact support and finite mass is obtained. We observe that the limit $y(\infty) := \lim_{r \to \infty} y(r) < 0$ exists, the metric quantity μ is defined by $e^{\mu(r)} = E_0 e^{-y(r)}$, and in order that μ has the correct boundary value at infinity we must define $E_0 = e^{y(\infty)}$. Since $y(R) = 0$ we also see that $E_0 = e^{\mu(R)}$. We want to relate the parameter κ to the redshift factor z of a photon which is emitted at the center $r = 0$ and received at the boundary R of the steady state; this is not the standard definition of the central redshift where the photon is received at infinity, but it is a more suitable parameter here:

$$z = \frac{e^{\mu(R)}}{e^{\mu(0)}} - 1 = \frac{e^{y(0)}}{e^{y(R)}} - 1 = e^\kappa - 1.$$

Hence κ is in one-to-one correspondence with the central redshift factor z with $\kappa \to 0$ iff $z \to 0$, and although this is not the standard terminology we

refer to κ as the central redshift. For a fixed ansatz function Φ we therefore obtain a family y_κ of solutions to (2.10) and a corresponding family

$$(f_\kappa, \lambda_\kappa, \mu_\kappa)_{\kappa\in]0,\infty[}$$

of steady galaxies to the Einstein-Vlasov system parametrized by the central redshift κ, and each member of this family has finite mass and compact support.

For small κ we want to relate the members of the above family to a suitable steady state of the Vlasov-Poisson system. For the latter we make the ansatz

$$f(x, v) = \Phi(E_0 - E)$$

where Φ has the same properties as above and $E_0 < 0$. We define $y = E_0 - U$ which satisfies the equation

$$y'(r) = -\frac{m(r)}{r^2} \tag{2.12}$$

where the mass function m is defined in terms of ρ as before and

$$\rho(r) = g_0(y(r))$$

with

$$g_0(y) := \begin{cases} 4\pi\sqrt{2}\int_0^y \Phi(\eta)\,(y-\eta)^{1/2}d\eta\ , & y > 0, \\ 0 & , y \le 0. \end{cases}$$

For every prescribed value $y(0)$ there exists a smooth solution of (2.12) which has a unique zero and gives a steady state of the Vlasov-Poisson system with finite mass and compact support, cf. [15].

3 The small redshift limit

In order that the solution y_κ of (2.10), (2.11) converges to some Newtonian limit as $\kappa \to 0$ we must properly rescale it. We define

$$a = \frac{k + 1/2}{2},$$

where we recall that k gives the leading order power in the expansion (2.4) of the profile Φ. We introduce a rescaled function $\bar{y} = \bar{y}_\kappa$ and a rescaled radial variable s by

$$y_\kappa(r) = \kappa\,\bar{y}_\kappa(\kappa^a r) = \kappa\,\bar{y}_\kappa(s), \quad s = \kappa^a r. \tag{3.1}$$

Our goal is to derive an equation for the function $\bar{y}$ which corresponds to the equation (2.10) for y. To do so, we introduce the smooth function F_κ by the relation

$$e^{-\kappa x} = 1 - \kappa x + \kappa^2 F_\kappa(x), \quad x \geq 0$$

and define

$$G_\kappa(x, \eta) := \eta^2 - F_\kappa(2x).$$

By (2.5), (2.6), and a change of variables,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(r) &= 4\pi e^{4\kappa\bar{y}(s)} \int_0^{\kappa\bar{y}(s)-\kappa^2 F_\kappa(\bar{y}(s))} \Phi(\eta)(1-\eta)^2 \left((1-\eta)^2 - e^{-2\kappa\bar{y}(s)}\right)^{1/2} d\eta \\ &= 4\pi\kappa^{3/2} e^{4\kappa\bar{y}(s)} \int_0^{\bar{y}(s)-\kappa F_\kappa(\bar{y}(s))} \Phi(\kappa\eta)(1-\kappa\eta)^2 \times \\ &\qquad (2(\bar{y}(s)-\eta) + \kappa G_\kappa(\bar{y}(s),\eta))^{1/2} \, d\eta.\end{aligned}$$

The analogous computation can be done for the pressure p, and we find the relations

$$\rho(r) = \kappa^{3/2}\tilde{\rho}_\kappa(s), \quad p(r) = \kappa^{5/2}\tilde{p}_\kappa(s), \quad m(r) = \kappa^{3/2-3a}\tilde{m}_\kappa(s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_\kappa(s) &:= 4\pi e^{4\kappa\bar{y}(s)} \int_0^{\bar{y}(s)-\kappa F_\kappa(\bar{y}(s))} \Phi(\kappa\eta)(1-\kappa\eta)^2 \times \\ &\qquad (2(\bar{y}(s)-\eta) + \kappa G_\kappa(\bar{y}(s),\eta))^{1/2} \, d\eta, \\ \tilde{p}_\kappa(s) &:= \frac{4\pi}{3} e^{4\kappa\bar{y}(s)} \int_0^{\bar{y}(s)-\kappa F_\kappa(\bar{y}(s))} \Phi(\kappa\eta) \, (2(\bar{y}(s)-\eta) + \kappa G_\kappa(\bar{y}(s),\eta))^{3/2} \, d\eta, \\ \tilde{m}_\kappa(s) &:= 4\pi \int_0^s \sigma^2 \tilde{\rho}_\kappa(\sigma) \, d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Keeping in mind (3.1) we find that

$$\frac{m(r)}{r^2} + 4\pi r p(r) = \kappa^{3/2-a} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} + 4\pi s \kappa \tilde{p}_\kappa(s) \right).$$

Moreover,

$$1 - \frac{2m(r)}{r} = 1 - \kappa^{3/2-2a} \frac{2\tilde{m}_\kappa(s)}{s},$$

and

$$y'(r) = \kappa^{1+a} \bar{y}'(s).$$

Combining the previous three equations we arrive at the equation

$$\bar{y}'(s) = -\frac{\kappa^{1/2-2a}}{1-\kappa^{3/2-2a}\frac{2\tilde{m}_\kappa(s)}{s}}\left(\frac{\tilde{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} + 4\pi s\kappa\tilde{p}_\kappa(s)\right)$$

satisfied by the rescaled function $\bar{y}$; the corresponding initial condition becomes $\bar{y}(0) = 1$. Finally we define

$$\Phi_\kappa(\eta) := \kappa^{1/2-2a}\Phi(\kappa\eta), \tag{3.2}$$

$$g_\kappa(x) := 4\pi e^{4\kappa x}\int_0^{x-\kappa F_\kappa(x)} \Phi_\kappa(\eta)(1-\kappa\eta)^2\left(2(x-\eta)+\kappa G_\kappa(x,\eta)\right)^{1/2} d\eta, \tag{3.3}$$

$$h_\kappa(x) := \frac{4\pi}{3}e^{4\kappa x}\int_0^{x-\kappa F_\kappa(x)} \Phi_\kappa(\eta)\left(2(x-\eta)+\kappa G_\kappa(x,\eta)\right)^{3/2} d\eta, \tag{3.4}$$

for $x > 0$, $g_\kappa(x) = h_\kappa(x) = 0$ for $x \le 0$, and

$$\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) := g_\kappa(\bar{y}_\kappa(s)), \quad \bar{p}_\kappa(s) := h_\kappa(\bar{y}_\kappa(s)), \quad \bar{m}_\kappa(s) := 4\pi\int_0^s \sigma^2\rho_\kappa(\sigma)\,d\sigma.$$

These rescaled functions are related to the original ones by

$$\rho_\kappa(r) = \kappa^{1+2a}\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s),\ p_\kappa(r) = \kappa^{2+2a}\bar{p}_\kappa(s),\ m_\kappa(r) = \kappa^{1-a}\bar{m}_\kappa(s). \tag{3.5}$$

We arrive at the following initial value problem which determines the rescaled function $\bar{y} = \bar{y}_\kappa$:

$$\bar{y}'(s) = -\frac{1}{1-\kappa\frac{2\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s}}\left(\frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} + 4\pi\kappa s\,\bar{p}_\kappa(s)\right), \quad \bar{y}(0) = 1. \tag{3.6}$$

We now show that as $\kappa \to 0$ the solutions of (3.6) converge to the solution of the corresponding Newtonian equation

$$y'(r) = -\frac{m_0(r)}{r^2},\ y(0) = 1. \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$m_0(r) := 4\pi\int_0^r \sigma^2 g_0(y(\sigma))\,d\sigma,$$

$$g_0(x) := 4\pi\sqrt{2}\int_0^x \Phi_0(\eta)(x-\eta)^{1/2}\,d\eta,\ x > 0, \tag{3.8}$$

$g_0(x) = 0$ for $x \le 0$, and

$$\Phi_0(\eta) := \lim_{\kappa\to 0}\Phi_\kappa(\eta),$$

more precisely:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\bar{y}_\kappa$ denote the solution of* (3.6) *and y_0 the solution of* (3.7)*. There exist constants $\delta > 0$, $C > 0$, and $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_0$ and $s \geq 0$,*

$$|\bar{y}_\kappa(s) - y_0(s)| \leq C\kappa^\delta.$$

Proof. First we note that the functions $\bar{y}_\kappa$ for $\kappa \geq 0$ are defined on $[0, \infty[$, and they are decreasing so that $\bar{y}_\kappa(s) \leq 1$ for $s \geq 0$ and $\kappa \geq 0$; here we define $\bar{y}_0 := y_0$. There exists $S_0 > 0$ such that $y_0(S_0) < 0$; S_0 is strictly to the right of the support of the Newtonian steady state corresponding to y_0. We aim to show that for $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small, $\bar{y}_\kappa(S_0) < 0$ as well.

First we note that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $\kappa \in]0, 1]$, and $x \in [0, 2]$ the estimates

$$|\Phi_\kappa(\eta)| + |G_\kappa(x, \eta)| \leq C,\ 0 \leq F_\kappa(x) \leq C$$

hold. This immediately implies that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \in]0, 1]$ and $s \in [0, \infty[$,

$$0 \leq \bar{\rho}_\kappa(s),\ \bar{p}_\kappa(s) \leq C_1.$$

Hence

$$\bar{m}_\kappa(s) = 4\pi \int_0^s \sigma^2 \bar{\rho}_\kappa(\sigma)\, d\sigma \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} C_1 s^3,\ s \geq 0,$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s} \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} C_1 S_0^2,\ \frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} C_1 S_0,\ s \in [0, S_0]. \tag{3.9}$$

We define

$$\kappa_0 := \left(\frac{16\pi}{3} C_1 S_0^2 \right)^{-1}.$$

Then (3.9) implies that for $s \in [0, S_0]$ and $\kappa \in]0, \kappa_0]$,

$$1 - \kappa \frac{2\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s} > \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{1 - \kappa \frac{2\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s}} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{16\pi}{3} C_1 S_0^2 \kappa. \tag{3.10}$$

In what follows C shall denote a positive constant which depends on the constants appearing above, which may change from line to line, and which

never depends on $s \in [0, S_0]$ or $\kappa \in]0, \kappa_0]$. The estimates which follow hold for all such s and κ. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{y}'_\kappa(s) - y'_0(s)| &\leq \frac{4\pi s\kappa \bar{p}_\kappa(s)}{1-\kappa\frac{2\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s}} + \left|\frac{1}{1-\kappa\frac{2\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s}} - 1\right| \frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} \\ &\quad + \left|\frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^2} - \frac{m_0(s)}{s^2}\right| \\ &\leq C\kappa + C\int_0^s |\bar{\rho}_\kappa(\sigma) - \rho_0(\sigma)|\, d\sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now we recall that $\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) = g_\kappa(\bar{y}_\kappa(s))$ where g_κ is defined in (3.3) for $\kappa > 0$ and in (3.8) for $\kappa = 0$. Under our assumptions on the ansatz function Φ the function g_0 is continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$, and its derivative is bounded on $]-\infty, 1]$. Hence

$$|\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) - \rho_0(s)| \leq |g_\kappa(\bar{y}_\kappa(s)) - g_0(\bar{y}_\kappa(s))| + C|\bar{y}_\kappa(s) - y_0(s)|.$$

To complete a Gronwall estimate for the latter difference it remains to estimate $g_\kappa - g_0$ uniformly on $[0, 1]$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}|g_\kappa(x) - g_0(x)| &\leq 4\pi\sqrt{2}\left|e^{4\kappa x} - 1\right| \int_0^{x-\kappa F_\kappa(x)} \dots \\ &\quad + 4\pi\sqrt{2}\,|\kappa F_\kappa(x)|\,||\Phi_0||_{L^\infty([0,1])} \\ &\quad + 4\pi\sqrt{2}\int_0^{x-\kappa F_\kappa(x)} \Big|\Phi_\kappa(\eta)(1-\kappa\eta)^2\left(x-\eta+\kappa\sqrt{2}^{-1}G(x,\eta)\right)^{1/2} \\ &\qquad\qquad -\Phi_0(\eta)(x-\eta)^{1/2}\Big|\, d\eta \\ &\leq C\kappa + \max_{0\leq\eta\leq x-\kappa F_\kappa(x)} |\dots|\,. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption on Φ,

$$|\Phi_\kappa(\eta) - \Phi_0(\eta)| \leq C\kappa^\delta, \eta \in [0, 1].$$

Moreover,

$$|(1-\kappa\eta)^2 - 1| \leq C\kappa.$$

Finally,

$$\left|\left(x-\eta+\kappa\sqrt{2}^{-1}G(x,\eta)\right)^{1/2} - (x-\eta)^{1/2}\right| \leq C\kappa^{1/2}|G(x,\eta)|^{1/2} \leq C\kappa^\delta$$

where we assume without loss of generality that $\delta \leq 1/2$. Combining these estimates implies that

$$|\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) - \rho_0(s)| \leq C\kappa^\delta + C|\bar{y}_\kappa(s) - y_0(s)|. \tag{3.12}$$

Inserting this into (3.11) and integrating in s implies that for all $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small and $s \in [0, S_0]$,

$$|\bar{y}_\kappa(s) - y_0(s)| \leq C\kappa^\delta + C\int_0^s |\bar{y}_\kappa(\sigma) - y_0(\sigma)|\, d\sigma$$

so that by Gronwall's Lemma,

$$|\bar{y}_\kappa(s) - y_0(s)| \leq C\kappa^\delta, \quad s \in [0, S_0].$$

In particular, this implies that $\bar{y}_\kappa(S_0) < 0$ for $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small.

We now show that the above estimate remains correct for $s \geq S_0$. For $s \geq S_0$ and $\kappa \in [0, \kappa_0]$ it holds that $\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) = 0$, and hence $m_\kappa(s) = M_\kappa$ is constant. Hence

$$y_0(s) = y_0(S_0) + \frac{M_0}{s} - \frac{M_0}{S_0}$$

and

$$\bar{y}_\kappa(s) = \bar{y}_\kappa(S_0) + \frac{1}{2\kappa}\ln\left(1 - 2\kappa\frac{M_\kappa}{S_0}\right) - \frac{1}{2\kappa}\ln\left(1 - 2\kappa\frac{M_\kappa}{s}\right).$$

Since $|\bar{y}_\kappa(S_0) - y_0(S_0)| \leq C\kappa^\delta$, $|M_\kappa - M_0| \leq C\kappa^\delta$, and

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa}\ln\left(1 - 2\kappa\frac{M_\kappa}{s}\right) = \frac{M_\kappa}{s} + \mathrm{O}(\kappa),$$

the assertion follows, and the proof is complete. □

Remark. Note that the limiting Newtonian polytrope $\Phi_0(\eta) = C\eta^k$ is determined solely by the leading order term in the expansion (2.4) of the relativistic profile Φ. This is interesting as it suggests that for small central redshifts the steady states to the Einstein-Vlasov system are effectively described by the pure Newtonian polytropes Φ_0.

The estimate from Theorem 3.1 implies some further information on the non-relativistic limit $\kappa \to 0$ which will also be needed in Section 5.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\kappa_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ be as in Theorem 3.1. There exist constants $S_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \in]0, \kappa_0]$,*

$$\operatorname{supp}\bar{\rho}_\kappa \subset [0, S_0], \tag{3.13}$$

and for all $s \geq 0$,

$$|\bar{\rho}_\kappa(s) - \rho_0(s)| + |\bar{y}'_\kappa(s) - y'_0(s)| \leq C\kappa^\delta. \tag{3.14}$$

In the original, unscaled variables,

$$\left|\kappa^{-1} y_\kappa(r) - y_0(\kappa^a r)\right| \leq C\kappa^\delta, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\left|e^{2\lambda_\kappa(r)} - 1\right| \leq C\kappa, \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\left|\kappa^{-1}\mu_\kappa(r) - U(\kappa^a r)\right| + |\kappa^{-1-2a}\rho_\kappa(r) - \rho_0(\kappa^a r)| \leq C\kappa^\delta. \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. The first assertion follows if we define S_0 as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and observe (3.3) together with the fact that $\bar{y}_\kappa(s) < 0$ for $s > S_0$. If we insert the estimate from Theorem 3.1 into (3.12) we obtain the first estimate in (3.14). Inserting this into (3.11) yields the second estimate in (3.14) where we need to observe the uniform control on the support of $\bar{\rho}_\kappa$. The estimate (3.15) follows by (3.1). The estimate for λ_κ follows from (3.10) and (3.5); notice that since $\bar{m}_\kappa$ is constant for $s \geq S_0$ the estimate a posteriori holds for all $s \geq 0$. The second estimate in (3.17) follows again by (3.1). It remains to show the estimate for μ_κ. We recall that $\mu_\kappa = \ln E_{0,\kappa} - y_\kappa$ and $U = E_0 - y_0$ where the boundary conditions for μ_κ and U imply that $\ln E_{0,\kappa} = \lim_{r\to\infty} y_\kappa(r)$ and $E_0 = \lim_{r\to\infty} = y_0(r)$. Hence by (3.15),

$$|\kappa^{-1} \ln E_{0,\kappa} - E_0| \leq C\kappa^\delta,$$

and the proof is complete. □

4 Stability for the Einstein-Vlasov system—a general discussion

The study of the dynamic stability of relativistic steady states representing static galaxies was initiated in the astrophysics literature in the 1960's, first by Ze'ldovitch and Podurets [24] and then by various other authors, see [8, 9, 10, 11, 23] and the references there. In these investigations the objects of study are *isotropic* steady states of the general form (1.6) which we considered above where in addition the profile is a decreasing function of the particle energy. The stability argument in the above works in short is as follows. A profile ϕ is fixed, and by an ad hoc variation of some physical

parameter such as the the central redshift of the galaxy, a one-parameter family of steady states is obtained. Then their dynamic stability against spherically symmetric perturbations is investigated by solving numerically the time-dependent system. The remarkable finding, which stands at variance with the analogous situation in the Newtonian case (cf. [6, 13]), is that for small values of the central redshift κ, the steady galaxies appear stable against spherically symmetric perturbations, but as the value of κ is increased, the stability changes to instability at some critical value κ_{cr}. In fact, numerical investigations suggest that this exchange is rather violent—there exist small perturbations of steady states with $\kappa > \kappa_{\mathrm{cr}}$ which appear to lead to gravitational collapse [3, 24]. It is the aim of our analysis to better understand this behavior; we should at this point emphasize that throughout the present paper we consider only the case of asymptotically flat spacetimes, which is appropriate for studying isolated systems like galaxies or globular clusters.

For the stability analysis of a system like the Einstein-Vlasov system it is essential to understand its conserved quantities. The flow of the time-dependent problem, which can for example be found in [7], preserves the ADM mass $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ADM}}$ and the Casimir functionals which act on spherically symmetric phase space densities $f = f(x, v)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ADM}}(f) = \iint \sqrt{1 + |v|^2} f \, dv \, dx, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mathcal{C}(f) = \iint e^{\lambda_f} \chi(f) \, dv \, dx, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\chi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\chi(0) = 0$. If $\chi = \mathrm{Id}$ the associated Casimir is called the particle number:

$$\mathcal{N}(f) = \iint e^{\lambda_f} f \, dv \, dx. \tag{4.3}$$

In the above and for what follows it is important to note that given a spherically symmetric state $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^6)$ the metric quantity $\lambda = \lambda_f$ is uniquely determined by (2.8) and (2.9) where the density ρ is defined in terms of f by (1.4); we occasionally write λ_f, ρ_f, m_f to emphasize that these quantities are determined by f. In order to define λ by (2.8) on $[0, \infty[$ we must require that

$$\frac{2m_f(r)}{r} < 1, \ r \geq 0;$$

a non-negative, spherically symmetric state $f \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^6)$ with this property is called *admissible*.

In [9, 10] the author computes explicitly the second variation of the ADM-mass about a given isotropic steady state, inspired by the formalism developed by Lynden-Bell for the Vlasov-Poisson system. This leads to a linear stability criterion which is then numerically investigated.

Following [3, 11, 23, 24] a related stability conjecture can be formulated. The binding energy

$$E_b = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ADM}} - \mathcal{N}}{\mathcal{N}}$$

of the steady state as a function of the central redshift κ has its first maximum at the critical value κ_{cr}, i.e., κ_{cr} is the smallest positive value κ where

$$\frac{d}{d\kappa} E_b(\kappa) = 0.$$

This condition can physically be interpreted as saying that once the difference between the total energy and the total particle number reaches its first maximum, it is advantageous from the energetic point of view to divide up the steady state into $\mathcal{N}$ particles of mass $m = 1$ thus creating an instability.

From the mathematics point of view the nonlinear stability properties of relativistic steady states are so far not understood. Numerical investigations of this question were reported on in [3], and in [22] the author employed variational methods for constructing steady states as minimizers of certain energy-Casimir type functionals. In [7], the present authors rigorously proved the positive definiteness of the second variation of the ADM mass for small parameter values along a one-parameter family, parametrized by the speed of light, in which the functional dependence (1.6) is varied by a suitable rescaling. The result is consistent with the above discussion in the sense that a posteriori the size of the central redshift can be related to the actual parameter, but it is not completely in line with the above discussion, where the profile ϕ (and the speed of light) is fixed and the central redshift is varied.

Above we have shown how to parametrize steady states of the Einstein-Vlasov system by the central redshift κ in such a way that as $\kappa \to 0$ the relativistic steady states are well approximated by a Newtonian one. This yields uniform estimates, which are used to show the coercivity of the second variation $D^2\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ADM}}(f_\kappa)$ of the ADM mass on certain dynamically accessible states when κ is sufficiently small, cf. the next section. On one hand, this provides a rigorous framework for the mathematical analysis of the results in the physics literature explained above, and on the other hand, it rigorously confirms the stability findings of Ze'ldovitch et al. at the level of a linear analysis. However, the coercivity result for the second variation of the ADM

mass is a *nonlinear* result, and it relies crucially on the full structure of the Einstein field equations.

For the sake of comparison we recall some facts concerning the stability analysis for the Vlasov-Poisson system, cf. [6, 13] and the references in the review articles [14, 17]. For an isotropic steady state f the basic stability condition is that the dependence on the particle energy is strictly decreasing on the support of f. If this condition holds all the members of the resulting one-parameter family of steady states, parametrized by the potential energy difference between the center and the boundary of the state, are non-linearly stable against general perturbations. The total energy as well as its second variation at a given steady state are a-priori indefinite. But using the existence of Casimir invariants the dynamics of the system can be restricted to a leaf $\mathcal{S}_f$ of perturbations $g : \mathbb{R}^6 \to \mathbb{R}$ which have the same level sets as the steady state f. On this leaf it is possible to establish the positive definiteness of the second variation of the Hamiltonian about f; we refer to [12] where this idea appears in the astrophysics literature. Due to the energy sub-critical nature of the equations, such a coercivity estimate can be used to prove nonlinear stability.

Given the fact that—as shown in the next section—a corresponding coercivity result for the second variation of the Hamiltonian can also be established for the relativistic case two open problems present themselves. The first one is the question of fully nonlinear stability and long-time behavior of the spacetimes generated by small perturbations of f_κ when κ is small. Unlike the Vlasov-Poisson system, the Einstein-Vlasov system is energy supercritical, and any nonlinear stability analysis will have to use the structure of the system more directly and not just through its conserved quantities. The second problem is the dynamic instability character of steady states with large κ and the study of the ensuing gravitational collapse. The global existence result for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system with small initial data [18] can be considered as a stability result for the vacuum solution, but the techniques required for the stability analysis of non-trivial steady states are different from such small data results. On the other hand, the existing results on gravitational collapse for the Einstein-Vlasov system so far cover only initial data which are very far from any steady state, cf. [1, 2, 4] and see also [5].

5 The coercivity estimate

Let $(f, \lambda, \mu) = (f_\kappa, \lambda_\kappa, \mu_\kappa)$ denote a steady state solution of the Einstein-Vlasov system which is a member of a family as constructed in Section 2; for the moment the dependence on the central redshift κ plays no role and is suppressed. We first need to recall the concept of linearly dynamically accessible perturbations from [7]. The transport structure of the Vlasov equation imposes a set of natural perturbations $(\delta f, \delta\lambda)$ whose defining property is the preservation of all Casimir invariants (4.2):

$$D\mathcal{C}(f)(\delta f) = \iint e^{\lambda} \left(\chi'(f)\delta f + \chi(f)\delta\lambda\right) dv\, dx = 0$$

for all $\chi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\chi(0) = 0$, where

$$\delta\lambda = e^{2\lambda}\frac{4\pi}{r}\int_0^r s^2\delta\rho(s)\, ds$$

and

$$\delta\rho(r) = \delta\rho(x) = \int \sqrt{1+|v|^2}\delta f(x,v)\, dv.$$

As shown in [7, Thm. 3.2], such perturbations are generated by spherically symmetric functions $h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^6)$ and take the form:

$$\delta f := e^{-\lambda}\{h, f\} + e^{\mu}\phi'(E)\frac{w^2}{\sqrt{1+|v|^2}}\delta\lambda, \tag{5.1}$$

where the variation of λ is a non-local functional of h :

$$\delta\lambda = 4\pi r e^{\mu+\lambda}\int \phi'(E)\, h(x,v)\, w\, dv. \tag{5.2}$$

Here ϕ is defined by (2.3) and $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ denotes the usual Poisson bracket

$$\{f, g\} := \partial_x f \cdot \partial_v g - \partial_v f \cdot \partial_x g$$

for two continuously differentiable functions f and g of $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The usual product rule for the Poisson bracket reads

$$\{f, gh\} = \{f, g\}h + \{f, h\}g.$$

States of the form (5.1) - (5.2) are called *linearly dynamically accessible from* f. In what follows we shall use the abbreviation

$$\langle v\rangle = \sqrt{1+|v|^2},$$

and we recall that $w = x \cdot v/r$.

Next we recall from [7, Eqn. (2.30)] the definition the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_\kappa(\delta f) &:= D^2\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ADM}}(f_\kappa)(\delta f, \delta f) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\iint \frac{e^{\lambda_\kappa}}{|\phi'(E)|}(\delta f)^2\, dv\, dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty e^{\mu_\kappa - \lambda_\kappa}\left(2r\mu_\kappa' + 1\right)(\delta\lambda)^2\, dr.\end{aligned}$$

associated with the ADM-mass; it should be noted that the parameter $\gamma = 1/c^2$ which was used in [7] is equal to unity here. We can now formulate our main result.

Theorem 5.1. *There exist constants $C^* > 0$ and $\kappa^* > 0$ such that for any $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa^*$ and any spherically symmetric function $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^6)$ which is odd in the v-variable the estimate*

$$\mathcal{A}_\kappa(\delta f) \geq C^* \iint |\phi'(E)| \left((rw)^2 \left| \left\{ E, \frac{h}{rw} \right\} \right|^2 + \kappa^{1+2a}|h|^2 \right) dv\, dx$$

holds. Here δf is the dynamically accessible perturbation generated by h according to (5.1).

Proof. We first recall some additional information on the Einstein field equations where we again for the moment suppress the dependence on κ. The field equations (1.2) and (1.3) suffice to determine λ and μ, but for what follows it is important to note that they do not constitute the complete set of field equations. Indeed, if these equations and the Vlasov equation hold, then also

$$e^{-2\lambda}\left(\mu'' + (\mu' - \lambda')(\mu' + \frac{1}{r})\right) = 4\pi q \tag{5.3}$$

with the tangential pressure q defined by

$$q(r) = q(x) = \int f(x,v) \left| \frac{x \times v}{r} \right|^2 \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1+|v|^2}}.$$

If we add the two field equations (1.2) and (1.3) it follows that

$$\lambda' + \mu' = 4\pi r e^{2\lambda}(\rho + p) \geq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Next we recall some auxiliary results from [7]. By [7, Lemma 3.3] the identity

$$\int \phi'(E) w^2 dv = -e^{-\mu}\,(\rho + p) \tag{5.5}$$

holds. According to [7, Lemma 4.3] for every spherically symmetric function $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^6)$ the estimate

$$\left(\int |\phi'(E)||wh| \, dv \right)^2 \leq e^{-\mu} (\rho + p) \int |\phi'(E)| h^2 dv \tag{5.6}$$

holds; here we used (5.4). Finally,

$$\{E, rw\} = e^{\mu} r \mu' \langle v \rangle - e^{\mu} \langle v \rangle + \frac{e^{\mu}}{\langle v \rangle} \tag{5.7}$$

cf. [7, Lemma 4.4]. As the last preparation for the proof of Theorem 5.1 we note that by Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \in]0, \kappa_0]$,

$$\|\bar{\rho}_\kappa\|_\infty, \ \|\bar{p}_\kappa\|_\infty, \ \|\bar{y}'_\kappa\|_\infty, \ \|\lambda_\kappa\|_\infty, \ \|\mu_\kappa\|_\infty \leq C; \tag{5.8}$$

from (1.4) and (1.5) it is clear that p is bounded by ρ. Moreover, for all $(x, v) \in \operatorname{supp} f_\kappa$ the following holds:

$$|x| \leq C\kappa^{-a}, \ |v|^2 \leq C\kappa \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$-\frac{\bar{y}'_\kappa(s)}{s} \geq c > 0, \tag{5.10}$$

provided $\kappa > 0$ is sufficiently small. As to (5.9) we recall from (3.13) that in the rescaled variables the spatial support of the steady state is contained in the interval $[0, S_0]$ with $S_0 > 0$ independent of κ. Together with the scaling (3.1) this proves the assertion on the spatial support. The properties of the ansatz function Φ imply that

$$E/E_0 = e^{\mu_\kappa(r)} \sqrt{1 + |v|^2}/E_0 = e^{-y_\kappa(r)} \sqrt{1 + |v|^2} \leq 1$$

on $\operatorname{supp} f_\kappa$ so that by the monotonicity of y_κ,

$$\sqrt{1 + |v|^2} \leq e^{y_\kappa(r)} \leq e^{\kappa}$$

which yields the bound on $|v|^2$. As to the lower bound on $-\bar{y}'_\kappa(s)/s$ we note that for $s \in]0, S_0]$,

$$-\frac{\bar{y}'_\kappa(s)}{s} \geq \frac{\bar{m}_\kappa(s)}{s^3} \geq \frac{4\pi}{s^3} \int_0^s \sigma^2 \rho_0(\sigma) \, d\sigma - \frac{4\pi}{3} \kappa^\delta.$$

Given the fact that ρ_0 is a continuous, non-negative function with $\rho_0(0) > 0$ the first term is bounded from below by a positive constant which is independent of κ, and (5.10) follows.

We now turn to the proof of the theorem. For simplicity of notation we drop the index κ in the notation for steady states as long as this dependence does not become essential. We define

$$\eta := \frac{1}{rw} h$$

which is well defined for $w = 0$ since h is odd in v. By the product rule for the Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$,

$$\{E, h\} = rw\{E, \eta\} + \eta\{E, rw\}. \tag{5.11}$$

Just like in [7] we notice that for a dynamically accessible perturbation δf defined by (5.1) and (5.2) we have the decomposition

$$2\mathcal{A}(\delta f) = \mathcal{A}_1(\delta f) + \mathcal{A}_2(\delta f), \tag{5.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_1(\delta f) &:= \iint e^{-\lambda} |\phi'(E)| |\{E, h\}|^2 dv\, dx - \int_0^\infty e^{\mu-\lambda}(2r\mu' + 1)(\delta\lambda)^2 dr, \\
&=: \mathcal{A}_{11}(\delta f) + \mathcal{A}_{12}(\delta f), \\
\mathcal{A}_2(\delta f) &:= -2 \iint |\phi'(E)| \{E, h\} \delta\lambda e^{\mu} \frac{w^2}{\langle v \rangle}\, dv\, dx \\
&\quad + \iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu+\lambda} \frac{w^4}{\langle v \rangle^2} (\delta\lambda)^2 dv\, dx \\
&=: \mathcal{A}_{21}(\delta f) + \mathcal{A}_{22}(\delta f).
\end{aligned}$$

It will turn out that $\mathcal{A}_1$ yields the desired lower bound while $\mathcal{A}_2$ is of higher order in κ and can be controlled by the positive contribution from $\mathcal{A}_1$.
Step 1—Estimate on $\mathcal{A}_1$. Proceeding just like in the proof of [7, Thm. 4.2], we obtain a lower bound on $\mathcal{A}_1(\delta f)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_1(\delta f) \geq & \iint |\phi'(E)| e^{-\lambda} (rw)^2 |\{E, h\}|^2 dv\, dx \\
& + \iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu-\lambda} h^2 \left[\mu'' - 3\mu'\lambda' - 2(\mu')^2 + \frac{2\mu' - \lambda'}{r\langle v \rangle^2} \right] dv\, dx;
\end{aligned}$$

cf. [7, Eqns. (4.9), (4.12)]. Using (5.3) and the fact that $q \geq 0$,

$$[\ldots] \geq -3(\mu')^2 - 2\mu'\lambda' + \frac{\lambda' - \mu'}{r} + \frac{2\mu' - \lambda'}{r\langle v \rangle^2}.$$

By 5.4, $\lambda' \geq -\mu'$, and hence

$$[\dots] \geq -2\mu'(\mu' + \lambda') - (\mu')^2 + \frac{\mu'}{r}\left(\frac{3}{\langle v\rangle^2} - 2\right) \tag{5.13}$$

We now switch to the rescaled quantities so that

$$\mu'_\kappa(r) = -\kappa^{1+a}\bar{y}'(s) \tag{5.14}$$

and by (5.4) and (3.5),

$$\lambda'(r) + \mu'(r) = 4\pi e^{2\lambda} r(\rho(r) + p(r)) = 4\pi\kappa^{1+a} s e^{2\lambda}\left(\rho_\kappa(s) + \kappa p_\kappa(s)\right).$$

Going back to (5.13) we choose κ sufficiently small so that by (5.9), $|v|^2 < 1/4$ and hence

$$[\dots] \geq -\kappa^{1+2a}\frac{\bar{y}'(s)}{s}\left[\frac{2}{5} - 8\pi\kappa e^{2\lambda}s^2\left(\bar{\rho}(s) + \kappa\bar{p}\right) - \kappa s\bar{y}'(s)\right].$$

The uniform bounds in (5.8) together with (5.10) imply that for $\kappa \in]0, \kappa_0]$ the estimate

$$[\dots] \geq C\kappa^{1+2a}$$

holds on $\operatorname{supp} f$ with some positive constant C, provided κ_0 is sufficiently small. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1(\delta f) \geq &\iint |\phi'(E)| e^{-\lambda}(rw)^2 |\{E,\eta\}|^2 dv\, dx \\ &+ C\kappa^{1+2a}\iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu-\lambda} h^2\, dv\, dx.\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Step 2—Estimate on $\mathcal{A}_2$. Using the decomposition (5.11) and keeping in mind that $\eta = h/rw$ and the formula (5.2) for $\delta\lambda$ we can rewrite $\mathcal{A}_{21}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{21} &= -8\pi\iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu+\lambda}\frac{rw^2}{\langle v\rangle}\{E,h\}\left(\int \phi'(E) h\tilde{w}\, d\tilde{v}\right) dv\, dx \\ &= -8\pi\iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu+\lambda}\frac{r^2w^3}{\langle v\rangle}\{E,\eta\}\left(\int \phi'(E) h\tilde{w}\, d\tilde{v}\right) dv\, dx \\ &\quad - 8\pi\iint |\phi'(E)| e^{2\mu+\lambda}\frac{w}{\langle v\rangle}\{E, rw\}h\left(\int \phi'(E) h\tilde{w}\, d\tilde{v}\right) dv\, dx \\ &=: X + Y.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho(r) + p(r) = \kappa^{1+a}\left(\rho_\kappa(s) + \kappa p_\kappa(s)\right)$, the uniform bounds in (5.8) together with (5.5) imply that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^3} \int |\phi'(E)| w^2 \, dv \leq C\kappa^{1+2a}. \tag{5.16}$$

Using the analogous argument on (5.6) implies that

$$\left(\int |\phi'(E)||wh| \, dv\right)^2 \leq C\kappa^{1+2a} \int |\phi'(E)| h^2 \, dv. \tag{5.17}$$

The bounds in (5.8) and (5.9), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the estimates (5.16), (5.17) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\leq C\kappa^{-a} \int \left| \int |\phi'(E)|^{1/2} w |\phi'(E)|^{1/2} r w \{E,\eta\} \, dv \right| \left| \int |\phi'(E)| h w \, dv \right| dx \\ &\leq C\kappa^{1+a} \left(\iint |\phi'(E)| |r w \{E,\eta\}|^2 dv \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\iint |\phi'(E)| h^2 dv \, dx \right)^{1/2}; \end{aligned}$$

in the first step we estimate one factor of r by $C\kappa^{-a}$. Hence by (5.15),

$$|X| \leq C\kappa^{1/2} \mathcal{A}_1.$$

In order to estimate the term Y we rewrite the identity (5.7):

$$\{E, rw\} = e^\mu r\mu' \langle v\rangle + e^\mu \left(-\langle v\rangle + \frac{1}{\langle v\rangle} \right) = e^\mu \left(r\mu' - \frac{v^2}{\langle v\rangle} \right).$$

Recalling (5.14) we obtain

$$|\{E, rw\}| = e^\mu \left| -\kappa s \bar{y}'(s) - \frac{v^2}{\langle v\rangle} \right| \leq C\kappa, \quad (x,v) \in \operatorname{supp} f,$$

where we used (5.9). Using this together with the estimates (5.8) we proceed as above to find that

$$\begin{aligned} |Y| &\leq C\kappa^{3+2a} \left(\iint |\phi'(E)| h^2 \, dv \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\iint |\phi'(E)| h^2 \, dv \, dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C\kappa^2 \mathcal{A}_1. \end{aligned}$$

From the above estimates for $|X|$ and $|Y|$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{A}_2 \geq -|X| - |Y| \geq -C\kappa^{1/2} \mathcal{A}_1,$$

and using (5.12) we finally infer that

$$\mathcal{A} \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}_1 - C\kappa^{1/2}\mathcal{A}_1 \geq \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{A}_1,$$

provided the central redshift κ is sufficiently small. In view of (5.15) the proof is complete. □

Theorem 5.1 in particular implies that the steady states of the Einstein-Vlasov system with small values of the central redshift κ are linearly stable against linearly dynamically accessible perturbations. This follows from the fact that the quadratic form $\mathcal{A}$ is a conserved quantity along the linearized dynamics. The proof is completely analogous to the one of [7, Thm. 6.2] and is left out.

References

[1] Andréasson, H., Kunze, M., Rein, G., Gravitational collapse and the formation of black holes for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system. *Quarterly of Appl. Math.* **LXVIII**, 17–42 (2010).

[2] Andréasson, H., Kunze, M., Rein, G., The formation of black holes in spherically symmetric gravitational collapse. *Mathematische Annalen* **350**, 683–705 (2011).

[3] Andréasson, H., Rein, G., A numerical investigation of the stability of steady states and critical phenomena for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23**, 3659–3677 (2006).

[4] Andréasson, H., Rein, G., Formation of trapped surfaces for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system. *J. Hyperbolic Differential Eqns.* **7**, 707–731 (2010).

[5] Dafermos, M., Rendall, A., An extension principle for the Einstein-Vlasov system under spherical symmetry. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **6**, 1137–1155 (2005).

[6] Guo, Y., Rein, G., A non-variational approach to nonlinear stability in stellar dynamics applied to the King model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **271**, 489–509 (2007).

[7] Hadžić, M., Rein, G., Stability for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Vlasov system—a coercivity estimate. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **155**, 529–556 (2013).

[8] Ipser, J., Thorne, K., Relativistic, spherically symmetric star clusters I. Stability theory for radial perturbations. *Astrophys. J.* **154**, 251–270 (1968).

[9] Ipser, J., Relativistic, Spherically Symmetric Star Clusters. II. Sufficient Conditions for Stability against Radial Perturbations. *Astrophys. J.* **156**, 509–527 (1969).

[10] Ipser, J., Relativistic, Spherically Symmetric Star Clusters. III. Stability of Compact Isotropic Models. *Astrophys. J.* **158**, 17–43 (1969).

[11] Kandrup, H., Morrison, P., Hamiltonian structure of the Vlasov-Einstein system and the problem of stability for spherical relativistic star clusters. *Annals of Physics* **225**, 114–166 (1993).

[12] Kandrup, H., Sygnet, J. F., A simple proof of dynamical stability for a class of spherical clusters. *Astrophys. J.* **298**, 27–33 (1985).

[13] Lemou, M., Mehats, F., Raphaël, P., Orbital stability of spherical systems. *Inventiones Math.* **187**, 145–194 (2012).

[14] Mouhot, C., Stabilité orbitale pour le système de Vlasov-Poisson gravitationnel, d'après Lemou-Méhats-Raphaël, Guo, Lin, Rein et al. *Séminaire Nicolas Bourbaki Nov. 2011*, arXiv:1201.2275 (2012).

[15] Ramming, T., Rein, G., Spherically symmetric equilibria for self-gravitating kinetic or fluid models in the non-relativistic and relativistic case—A simple proof for finite extension. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, **45**, 900–914 (2013).

[16] Rein, G., Static solutions of the spherically symmetric Vlasov-Einstein system. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **115**, 559–570 (1994).

[17] Rein, G., Collisionless kinetic equations from astrophysics—The Vlasov-Poisson system. In *Handbook of Differential Equations, Evolutionary Equations, vol. 3*, edited by C. M. Dafermos and E. Feireisl, Elsevier (2007).

[18] Rein, G., Rendall, A., Global existence of solutions of the spherically symmetric Vlasov-Einstein system with small initial data. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **150**, 561–583 (1992). Erratum: *Commun. Math. Phys.* **176**, 475–478 (1996).

[19] Rein, G., Rendall, A., The Newtonian limit of the spherically symmetric Vlasov-Einstein system. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **150**, 585–591 (1992).

[20] Rein, G., Rendall, A., Smooth static solutions of the spherically symmetric Vlasov-Einstein system. *Ann. de l'Inst. H. Poincaré, Physique Théorique* **59**, 383–397 (1993).

[21] Rein, G., Rendall, A., Compact support of spherically symmetric equilibria in non-relativistic and relativistic galactic dynamics. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **128**, 363–380 (2000).

[22] Wolansky, G., Static solutions of the Vlasov-Einstein system. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **156**, 205–230 (2001).

[23] Zel'dovich, Ya. B. , Novikov, I. D., *Relativistic Astrophysics* **Vol. 1**, Chicago: Chicago University Press (1971).

[24] Zel'dovich, Ya. B. , Podurets, M. A., The evolution of a system of gravitationally interacting point masses. *Soviet Astronomy—AJ* **9**, 742749 (1965), translated from *Astronomicheskii Zhurnal* **42**.